

Applicant : Klaus Schulz et al.  
Serial No. : 09/672,571  
Filed : September 27, 2000  
Page : 12 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 12754-051001 / 00P7411

### REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-16 and 18-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirements. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 6-8, 10-15, 18-21 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,149,465 ("Berg"). Claims 2-4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berg as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,022,151 ("Meyer-Guldner"). Claims 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berg in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,095,862 ("Doye").

Claims 1, 8, 15, 18, 21, 23 and 24 have been amended and claim 17 is cancelled. Claim 29 is new. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration in view of the amendments and following remarks.

#### **I. Claim Objections**

Claims 1, 8, 15 and 24 are objected to because of informalities identified by the Examiner. The claims have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections and are now in condition for allowance.

#### **II. The § 112 Rejections**

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Examiner asserts there is a lack of sufficient description in the specification as to how the release mechanism is selectively movable between at least a first position and the second position. Additionally, claims 1-4, 6, 7, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner asserts it is unclear relative to what the release mechanism is selectively movable.

Applicant : Klaus Schulz et al.  
Serial No. : 09/672,571  
Filed : September 27, 2000  
Page : 13 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 12754-051001 / 00P7411

Claims 1-4, 6 and 7

Claim 1 recites a pluggable transceiver including a housing, a cam and a release mechanism. The housing has a front end configured to couple to a transmission cable and a back end configured to be inserted into a cage. The cam is disposed on an exposed bottom outer surface of a transceiver housing and configured to engage the transceiver within the cage. The release mechanism is attached to the bottom surface of the housing between the cam and the front end of the housing and is selectively movable between at least a first position and a second position. The release mechanism is in the first position when the transceiver is engaged within the cage, and is moved along the bottom surface from the first position toward the cam and into the second position to disengage the transceiver from the cage.

FIG. 1B shows an embodiment of the release mechanism, which includes release block 50, in the first position. As shown in FIG. 1B, the release block 50 is attached to the bottom surface of the housing between the cam 44 and the front end. FIG. 1C is new and has been added to show the release block 50 in the second position. The release block 50 has been moved along the bottom surface of the housing toward the cam 44. As described in the specification, the release block 50 is moved into the second position such that the latch 40 on the cage 24 is displaced outwardly by an amount sufficient for the rear edge of the cam 44 to clear the rear edge of a slot 42 formed in the latch 40 (Specification, p. 5, lines, 2-4). As such, the addition of FIG. 1C does not constitute new matter.

FIG. 3A has been amended to illustrate an embodiment of a longitudinal slot 51 described in the Specification at page 4, line 32 to page 5, line 2. As such, the amendment of FIG. 3A to show the longitudinal slot does not constitute new matter. That is, a release block 50 is slidable toward and away from the cam 44 and the back end of the transceiver module 20 within the longitudinal slot 51 defined in the bottom surface of the transceiver module 20. The release block 50 is shown in a first position in FIG. 3A, and is shown in a second position in new FIG. 3C. FIGS. 3B and 3D illustrate side views of the release block 50 in the first position and second position respectively.

Applicant : Klaus Schulz et al.  
Serial No. : 09/672,571  
Filed : September 27, 2000  
Page : 14 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 12754-051001 / OOP7411

The applicant respectfully submits that it is clear from the specification, the figures and the claims, as amended, that the release mechanism, *e.g.*, release block 50, moves relative to the bottom surface of the transceiver module 20 within a longitudinal slot, such as the embodiment of a longitudinal slot 51 shown in FIGS. 3A and 3C. The release block 50 can slide within the longitudinal slot using techniques known in the art. Accordingly, the applicant submits that claim 1 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's § 112 rejections and is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-4, 6 and 7 depend from claim 1 and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

#### Claims 21 and 23

Claim 21 recites the data coupling system of claim 17, where the release mechanism is selectively movable between at least a first position and a second position. The release mechanism is in the first position when the transceiver is engaged within the cage and is moved along the bottom surface from the first position toward the cam and into the second position to disengage the transceiver from the cage. For at least the reasons stated above in reference to claim 1, claim 21 as amended sufficiently describes the movement of the release mechanism. That is, the release mechanism moves along the bottom surface of the transceiver module toward the cam, which is also illustrated in FIGS. 1B, 1C and 3A-D. Accordingly, claim 21 is in condition for allowance. Claim 23 has been amended to depend from claim 22 and is in condition for allowance.

#### **III. The § 102 Rejections**

Claims 1, 6-8, 10-15, 18-21 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Berg. The Examiner asserts that Berg (referring to Berg's Fig. 7) discloses a pluggable transceiver including a housing 22 having a front end and back end, a cam 74 disposed on an exposed outer surface of the transceiver housing, and a release mechanism/block 75 attached to the housing.

Claim 1 recites a pluggable transceiver including a housing, a cam and a release mechanism. The cam is disposed on an exposed bottom outer surface of a transceiver housing and configured to engage the transceiver within the cage. The release mechanism is attached to

Applicant : Klaus Schulz et al.  
Serial No. : 09/672,571  
Filed : September 27, 2000  
Page : 15 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 12754-051001 / 00P7411

the bottom surface of the housing between the cam and the front end of the housing and is selectively movable between at least a first position and a second position. The release mechanism is in the first position when the transceiver is engaged within the cage, and is moved along the bottom surface from the first position toward the cam and into the second position to disengage the transceiver from the cage.

The Examiner asserts that element 75, which is illustrated in Berg's FIG. 3, is a release mechanism as required by claim 1. Element 75 shown in Berg's FIG. 3 is "resilient extension" of a "guide rail 38", and is part of a connector 24, not the module 22 referred to by the Examiner as a housing. That is, the module 22 does not even include element 75. Referring to Berg's figure 7, element 74, which the Examiner asserts is a cam, is nearly flush with a front end of the module 22, and there is no element between the cam and the end of the module 22 at all, nevermind an element that can be a release mechanism as required by claim 1. That is, there is no "release mechanism is attached to the bottom surface of the housing between the cam and the front end of the housing" as required by the claim. Accordingly, the elements of claim 1 are not disclosed by Berg. Claim 1 is therefore not anticipated by Berg and is in condition for allowance. Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

#### Claims 8, 10-14 and 23

Claim 8 recites a cage configured to receive a pluggable transceiver having a transceiver cam including a cage housing and a latch. The cage housing is substantially rectangular shaped, forms an interior region and has an open front end for receiving the pluggable transceiver and defining a slot for engaging the transceiver cam. The latch is disposed at the front end of the cage housing and configured to bend outwardly from an original position in response to a force applied by the transceiver cam as the transceiver is being inserted into the cage and to resiliently return to the original position upon engagement of the transceiver cam with the slot defined in the front end of the cage housing. The latch includes a front end having an inner surface that flares outwardly away from the interior region of the cage housing.

Applicant : Klaus Schulz et al.  
Serial No. : 09/672,571  
Filed : September 27, 2000  
Page : 16 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 12754-051001 / 00P7411

The Examiner asserts that Berg discloses a cage, referring to connector 24 shown in Berg's figure 3, that includes a housing and a latch 75. Berg's connector 24 is not a substantially rectangular shaped cage housing that forms an interior region. By contrast, the connector 24 is substantially flat element that a module 22 can connect on top of, as shown in FIG. 2, and is not housed within an interior region formed by the connector 24. Accordingly, Berg fails to disclose a cage having a substantially rectangular shaped cage housing forming an interior region and an open front end for receiving the pluggable transceiver and defining a slot for engaging a transceiver cam, as required by claim 8. Claim 8 is therefore not anticipated by Berg and is in condition for allowance. Claims 10-14 and 23 depend from claim 8 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

#### Claims 15 and 18-21

Claim 15 recites a data coupling system including a pluggable transceiver and a cage. The pluggable transceiver includes a housing having a front end configured to couple to a transmission cable. The transceiver housing includes a cam disposed on an exposed outer surface of the transceiver housing and a release mechanism disposed on the exposed outer surface of the transceiver housing between the front end and the cam and configured to disengage the cam from a cage slot. For at least the reasons stated above in reference to claim 1, Berg fails to disclose a transceiver housing including a release mechanism disposed on an exposed outer surface of the transceiver housing between a front end and a cam, and configured to disengage the cam from a cage slot. Accordingly, Berg does not disclose the limitations of claim 15. Claim 15 is therefore not anticipated by Berg and is in condition for allowance. Claims 18-21 depend from claim 15 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

#### Claims 24-27

Claim 24 recites a cage configured to receive a pluggable transceiver having a transceiver cam, the cage including a cage housing and a latch disposed at the front end of the cage housing. The cage housing is substantially rectangular shaped, forms an interior region and has a front end for receiving the pluggable transceiver and defining a slot for engaging the transceiver cam. The cage housing is configured to shield a pluggable transceiver housed in the interior region against

Applicant : Klaus Schulz et al.  
Serial No. : 09/672,571  
Filed : September 27, 2000  
Page : 17 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 12754-051001 / OOP7411

electromagnetic interference. As discussed above in reference to claim 8, Berg fails to disclose a cage including a cage housing that is substantially rectangularly shaped and forms an interior region. Further, Berg fails to disclose a cage housing configured to shield a pluggable transceiver housed in the interior region against electromagnetic interference, as required by the claim. Accordingly, the limitations of claim 24 are not anticipated by Berg and claim 24 is in condition for allowance. Claims 25-27 depend from claim 24 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

#### IV. The § 103 Rejections

Claims 2-4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berg as applied to claims 1 and 15 in view of Meyer-Guldner. As stated above, Berg fails to disclose the limitations of the base claims 1 and 15, and Meyer-Guldner does not disclose the limitations of the base claims not disclosed by Berg. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above in reference to the base claims 1 and 15, claims 2-4 and 16 are allowable.

Claims 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berg in view of Doye. Claim 11 recites the cage of claim 8, wherein the housing further includes an upper portion, a lower portion and at least two sidewalls thereby forming an interior region and wherein the pluggable transceiver is received into the interior region. The Examiner asserts that Doye teaches a cage housing for a similar structure including sidewalls, and it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to include sidewalls in the structure of Berg to provide shielding for the sides of the inserted connector.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner, and submits there is no motivation to modify the connector disclosed by Berg with the metal adapter frame disclosed by Doye. There is nothing disclosed in Berg that suggests that an enclosed connector is desirable. Rather, Berg seems teach against this, as Berg indicates a preferred width of the connector of 12 mm, stating that "[t]his miniaturization allows two or more such connectors 24 to be mounted side-by-side in a standard PCMCIA-width opening 30 to increase port density". If the connector 24 were to include sidewalls, as suggested by the Examiner, the width would increase, which may interfere with the advantage of miniaturization and increased port density touted by Berg.

Applicant : Klaus Schulz et al.  
Serial No. : 09/672,571  
Filed : September 27, 2000  
Page : 18 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 12754-051001 / 00P7411

Accordingly, the applicant submits it is improper to combine the Berg and Doye references, and claim 22 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 28 recites the cage of claim 24, wherein the housing further includes an upper portion, a lower portion and at least two sidewalls thereby forming an interior region and wherein the pluggable transceiver is received into the interior region. For at least the reasons stated above in reference to claim 22, the applicant submits it is improper to combine Berg and Doye, and claim 28 is in condition for allowance.

#### **V. Information Disclosure Statement**

The applicant submitted an Information Disclosure Statement on November 25, 2003, and requests that the Examiner consider the references cited therein and sign the 1449 sheet. A copy of the IDS as filed is attached for the Examiner's convenience.

Brenda Leeds Binder has been given limited recognition under 37 CFR § 10.9(b) as an employee of the Fish & Richardson PC law firm to prepare and prosecute patent applications wherein the patent applicant is a client of Fish & Richardson PC and the attorney or agent of record in the applications is a registered practitioner who is a member of Fish & Richardson, which is the case in the present application. A copy of the Limited Recognition document, which expires December 1, 2004, is attached hereto.

Please charge \$86.00 to deposit account 06-1050 for excess claim fees. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Klaus Schulz et al.  
Serial No. : 09/672,571  
Filed : September 27, 2000  
Page : 19 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 12754-051001 / 00P7411

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

*July 28/04*

*B. Leeds*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Brenda Leeds Binder

Limited Recognition under 37 CFR § 10.9(b)

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500  
Redwood City, California 94063  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50217160.doc